

E

435

S 574

Co 100







Class E 435


Book S 54

copy 2









SHORT ANSWERS

TO

RECKLESS FABRICATIONS,

AGAINST THE

Democratic Candidate for President,

JAMES BUCHANAN.



PHILADELPHIA:
WILLIAM RICE, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER,
PENNSYLVANIAN BUILDING, 46 S. THIRD STREET.
1856.

E-35

10/24

Colony

SHORT ANSWERS TO RECKLESS FABRICATIONS.

THE "DROP OF BLOOD" FALSEHOOD.

It must be a desperate calumny that Horace Greeley will not circulate against a political opponent. In his *New York Tribune*, of the 7th of June, 1856, he refuses to endorse the story, that Mr. Buchanan had once declared, that "if he had a drop of Democratic blood in his body, he would open his veins and let it out." Mr. Greeley says :

"There has long been a story current that, in his old Federal days, Mr. Buchanan once declared, that 'if he supposed he had a drop of Democratic blood in his veins, he would open them and let it out.' We do not think any one who knew Mr. Buchanan, can have ever credited this tale. There is not a man living more unlikely to make rash, silly speeches, than he is."

It is scarcely necessary to add refutation to this *amende honorable*; but as the accusation, contemptible as it is, may require some new authoritative contradiction, we give Mr. Buchanan's own words, in a letter to the *Philadelphia Courier and Enquirer*, introduced by the editor of the *Harrisburg Reporter* :

[From the Washington Union.]

THE "DROP OF BLOOD" CALUMNY.

We published yesterday the emphatic denunciation by the *Lancaster Intelligencer*, of the base calumny which attributed to Mr. Buchanan the declaration, that "if he had a drop of Democratic blood in his veins, he would let it out." It seems now that this falsehood originated in 1828, when Mr. Buchanan was a candidate for Congress as a Jackson Democrat. The charge was revived a few years afterwards, when Mr. Buchanan came forward with the characteristic straightforwardness and frankness of his nature, and denounced it as an unmitigated calumny. We copy from the *Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Reporter*, the letter of Mr

Buchanan, with the single remark that, with such a refutation as we now present, no one can repeat the slander without knowingly giving currency to a falsehood :

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Reporter.]

We observe by the report of Congressional proceedings, in the *National Intelligencer*, of March 30th, that on the previous Friday evening, our Senator Buchanan was assailed by Mr. Morgan, of New York, and Mr. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, upon the floor of the House of Representatives, with the charge of once having said, in a 4th of July oration, "that if he thought he had one drop of Democratic blood in his veins, he would let it out." This charge was promptly contradicted by Messrs. Ramsey and General Keim, of the Pennsylvania delegation.

It is not our intention, at present, to make any comments upon this ridiculous story, which first originated in 1828, immediately preceding Mr. Buchanan's fifth election to Congress, but merely to re-publish the letter of that gentleman to the editor of the *Pennsylvania Inquirer and Courier*, dated February 27, 1838, contradicting the charge so explicitly and unequivocally, as to silence the slander, it was supposed, forever. This letter was elicited by a similar charge, made in debate by Mr. Cox, a member of the Convention for amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania, in May, 1837. It was then promptly repelled, before the Convention, by the present Judge Porter and Emanuel C. Reigart, both members of that body—the first a prominent Democrat, and the latter one of the anti-Masonic party in Pennsylvania. Had this sentiment, or anything like it, ever been uttered by Mr. Buchanan at a "political meeting in the court-house in Lancaster," these two gentlemen, from their position and character, must either have heard it themselves, or immediately heard it from others; both of them being residents of that city when it was alleged to have been uttered, and Mr. Reigart, residing there ever since. The charge would have specially attracted public attention at that time, as Mr. Buchanan was a successful candidate for the State Legislature both in October, 1814, and October, 1815.

Mr. Cox, not satisfied with the contradiction of Mr. Porter and Mr. Reigart, endeavored to obtain *proof* of the charge, and renewed, in a letter to the editor of the *Pennsylvania Inquirer and Courier*, dated February 24, and published in that paper of February 26, 1838, the testimony which he then adduced in support of it, and all which could be collected after a laborious search, consists of the certificate of a certain Anthony McGlenn, and an extract of a letter from George Ford, Jr., both of which, it will be perceived, are referred to in the following letter of Mr. Buchanan :

To the Editor of the Pennsylvania Inquirer and Courier :

WASHINGTON CITY, February 27, 1838.

SIR:—I have this moment perused the letter of J. F. Cox, published in yesterday's *Inquirer*. His late official station, as a member of the Convention, induces me to notice the stale slander which he again repeats, and which I now pronounce to be utterly and absolutely false, no matter

from what source it may have proceeded or shall proceed. I never did, upon any occasion, public or private, whether at the court-house in Lancaster, or elsewhere, declare that "if I knew I had a drop of Democratic blood in my veins, I would let it out," or any words to that effect. *This ridiculous story is without the shadow of foundation.*

The first version of the story was, that I had used the expression in an oration which I had delivered at the court-house in Lancaster, on the 4th of July, 1825. The oration itself disproved this assertion; and then, after Mr. Cox had made it a subject of debate before the Reform Convention, in May last, one of the papers at Harrisburg solemnly announced that the expression had been used by me on the floor of the House of Representatives, in this city, in reply to Gov. Floyd, of Virginia, and that it could be proved by a gentleman who had formerly been a Democratic representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. The scene is now again shifted to the court-house in Lancaster, and a certain Anthony M'Glinn is the witness. He states, that "a number of years ago, one evening," whilst I was addressing a political meeting there assembled, he had heard me use the expression already stated, "in an emphatic manner, with my right hand elevated above my head." He does not state the year when this expression was used, nor the name of any other person who was present at this public meeting.

It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Cox, that if I had uttered such a sentiment as that attributed to me in the court-house at Lancaster, it would have been heard by hundreds of people; that it would immediately have become the subject of universal remark and universal condemnation, and that it would have been severely and justly commented upon in the newspapers of the day. Had it been true, there would have been no occasion to resort to Anthony M'Glinn to prove the charge, nor to a conversation alleged by Mr. Ford to have been held with Peter Shindle, who, although a respectable, is an aged man; and from a defect of memory, incident to that period of life, must have confounded what may have been stated to him by others with what he had heard himself. But, I repeat again, no matter who has been or shall be the witness, the tale is utterly and absolutely false.

Shortly after, the slander was made a subject of debate by Mr. Cox in the Reformed Convention; a number of the oldest and most respectable citizens of Lancaster, without distinction of party, signed a certificate disproving the charge, so far as it was possible for a negative to be proved, which was placed and still remains in the hands of one of my friends. After what had been said in reply to Mr. Cox by Mr. Porter and Mr. Reigart—who must either have heard the expression had it been used, or heard it immediately after—I deemed it wholly unnecessary then to publish this certificate.

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

We have said, in the commencement of this article, that we would at this time publish nothing in refutation of this charge but Mr. Buchanan's own letter. We have, however, procured a copy of the certificate to which Mr. B. refers, and give it publicity below for the first time. In

doing so, we will boldly assert, that the thirty subscribers to it are gentlemen of as much moral worth and respectability as can be found among the same number of individuals in any other community in the Union; and we venture to say, that NO RESPECTABLE MAN IN PENNSYLVANIA, OF ANY POLITICAL PARTY, after reading Mr. B's contradiction, endorsed by the cool and deliberate declaration of these gentlemen, will reiterate the charge, believing himself in its truth :

CERTIFICATE.

Several of the undersigned have known Mr. Buchanan ever since he first came to Lancaster to study law with the late James Hopkins, and the others for many years past. We are all convinced that, if at a public meeting at the court-house, or anywhere else in this city, he had ever used such an expression, or anything like it, as that which has been attributed to him by Mr. Cox in the Convention, to wit: "that he thanked his God he had not a drop of Democratic blood in his veins, and if he had, he would let it out," some of us would have heard it, and *all* of us would have heard of it, and it must have become a subject of general conversation throughout Lancaster. To the best of our knowledge, it never was mentioned by any person until the year 1828, immediately before Mr. Buchanan's last election to Congress on the Democratic Jackson ticket. As this election immediately preceded General Jackson's first election to the Presidency, (in November, 1828,) and as Mr. Buchanan had been for several years previously his ardent and active supporter, he was then opposed with much zeal and bitterness.

Ever since we first heard this story, referring back as it did to 1815, we have always believed, and still believe, that it was got up without any foundation in fact, for the purpose of operating against Mr. Buchanan's election to Congress in 1828. Indeed, we had never supposed that any person acquainted with his character could believe that at any period of life he would have made such a declaration as now seems to be seriously imputed to him.

Wm. Jenkins,
Wm. B. Fordney,
Reab Frazer,
F. A. Muhlenberg,
John Mathiot,
William Norris,
John Christ,
George Musser,
William Friek,
Samuel Dale,
Joseph Ogilby,
John F. Steimaan,
Emanuel C. Reigart,
Adam Reigart,
Benjamin Champneys,

Jas. Humes,
Geo. H. Krug,
Wm. Cooper,
John N. Lane,
John Reynolds,
John R. Montgomery,
Henry Rogers,
Jacob Demuth,
Christian Bachman,
John Bomberger,
John Ross,
John Evans,
John Miller,
Henry Keffler,
George Messenkop.

The Harrisburg *Reporter* referred to, is not now published; but at the time the editorial above copied was written and printed, it was the Democratic State paper of Pennsylvania. The Mr. Cox, who made the charge against Mr. Buchanan, has been dead for some years; but before he died, he became a Democrat, and fully and repeatedly atoned for the wrong he did to Mr. Buchanan. Indeed, he became one of Mr. Buchanan's best friends. Of the signers to the card above quoted, a number have died. There were Democrats and Whigs on this list. Among those still living is Hon. E. C. Reigart, who was opposed to the Democracy in 1838, even while defending Mr. Buchanan against this aspersion. He is a distinguished politician and lawyer. He is now Mr. Buchanan's decided advocate for the Presidency.

FABRICATION NO. II.

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE WAR OF 1812.

Some of the opposition papers are re-publishing an oration alleged to have been delivered by Mr. Buchanan on the 4th of July, 1815; and he is falsely accused of having opposed the vigorous prosecution of the war of 1812. In 1847, after he was appointed Secretary of State by Mr. Polk, a similar charge was made against him in Tennessee, of which he was informed by Hon. George W. Jones, a leading member of the present Congress from that State. Mr. Buchanan replied by the following letter, which so clearly covers the whole ground, that all necessity for further comment is precluded:

WASHINGTON, April 23, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have this moment received your letter of the 15th inst., and hasten to return an answer.

In one respect I have been fortunate as a public man. My political enemies are obliged to go back for more than thirty years to find plausible charges against me.

In 1814, when a very young man, (being this day 56 years of age,) I made my first public speech before a meeting of my fellow-citizens of Lancaster. The object of this speech was to urge upon them the duty of volunteering their services in defence of their invaded country. A volunteer company was raised upon the spot, in which I was the first, I believe, to enter my name as a private. We forthwith proceeded to Baltimore, and served until we were honorably discharged.

In October, 1814, I was elected a member of the Pennsylvania Legis-

lature; and in that body gave my support to every measure calculated, in my opinion, to aid the country against the common enemy.

In 1815, after peace had been concluded, I did express opinions in relation to the causes and conduct of the war, which I very soon after regretted and recalled. Since that period I have been ten years a member of the House of Representatives, and an equal time of the Senate, acting a part on every great question. My political enemies, finding nothing assailable throughout this long public career, now resort to my youthful years for expressions to injure my political character. The brave and generous citizens of Tennessee, to whatever party they may belong, will agree that this is a hard measure of justice, and it is still harder that, for this reason, they should condemn the President for having voluntarily offered me a seat in his Cabinet.

I never deemed it proper, at any period of my life, whilst the country was actually engaged in war with a foreign enemy, to utter a sentiment which could interfere with its successful prosecution. Whilst the war with Great Britain was raging, I should have deemed it little better than moral treason to paralyze the arm of the Government whilst dealing blows against the enemy. After peace was concluded, the case was then different. My enemies cannot point to an expression uttered by me during the continuance of the war, which was not favorable to its vigorous prosecution.

From your friend, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Hon. GEORGE W. JONES.

FORMER OPPONENTS AND PRESENT OPPONENTS PAYING TRIBUTE TO MR. BUCHANAN'S INTEGRITY, AND REFUTING ATTACKS UPON HIS CHARACTER.

This pamphlet might be extended through many pages, by extracts from the speeches of former opponents, now acting with the Democratic party, and those supporting other candidates, bearing testimony either to Mr. Buchanan's spotless reputation and statesmanlike ability, or else contradicting the stories in circulation against him.

Let us take Andrew Jackson Donelson, now a candidate for the Vice-Presidency, on the Fillmore ticket, and we find that, while he was editor of the *Washington Union*, on the 5th of June, 1851, he defended Mr. Buchanan against an attack of the organ of Mr. Fillmore's administration, in the following language :

"But the special organ, instead of manfully acknowledging the error which has been committed by its party in the countenance it has given to political *anti-slavery organization*—an error not denied nor even concealed by the President, or any one of his cabinet ministers, in the various speeches which they have addressed to the abolition districts of New

York—imagines that it is its office to neutralize the force of such a fact, by reviving the stale charge of Federalism against Mr. Buchanan, who is one, amongst some eight or ten of the prominent men in the Democratic party, that may be brought before a National Convention, whose duty it will be to put some one of them in nomination for the Presidency. This gentleman has friends who will doubtless, in due season, make a more detailed vindication of his character than we have done in this hasty article. What we have said, is not a defence of Mr. Buchanan as a candidate for the Presidency, but as a member of the party in whose service he has acquired the high respect of his fellow-citizens, and has proved that he possesses the eminent ability and patriotism, which justified the confidence given to him by the State which he so long represented in the Senate of the United States, and afterwards by President Polk, who gave him the first place in his Cabinet."

The Hon. Oscar F. Moore, at present a representative in Congress from the Ross district, Ohio, a leading member of the Opposition party, in a letter to his constituents, defines his position as follows :

"With the announcement of the nomination of Fremont, as it spread with lightning rapidity over the land, expired the last hope that lingered around the Philadelphia Convention. What a fall! Judge McLean, with all his age, learning and experience, his fame, his stern integrity—the hopes of quiet, peace, purity, safety and glory to the country, concentrated in him—rejected! And a man, whose only merit, so far as history records it, is in the fact, that he was born in South Carolina, crossed the Rocky Mountains, subsisted on frogs, lizzards, snakes and grasshoppers, and *captured* a woolly horse, chosen as the person to control the destinies of this great nation! And this too, by the cool, deliberate, intellectual men of New England and the North!! But what shall we do! If Judge McLean had been nominated, no one could have hesitated. Nor can I now hesitate to take position. As warmly and as steadily as I have heretofore opposed the Democratic party, and as bitterly as I denounced the Cincinnati Platform now, with my respect for the ability, age and experience of Mr. Buchanan, and with my *contempt* for the claims of Fremont, and the *arrant folly*—to use no harsher term—of those who *dictated* his nomination, if I were *compelled* this day to choose between them, I should vote for Mr. Buchanan."

Thaddeus Stevens, with a full knowledge of Mr. Buchanan's position, (he resides in Mr. Buchanan's own county,) declared in the Philadelphia Black Republican Convention, that Mr. B. would carry the State of Pennsylvania by fifty thousand majority. He said :

Mr. Stevens saw what the current of the Convention was—he did not rise to resist it—but he admonished delegates to take care it does not sweep away friends as well as foes. [Applause.] Pennsylvania is embarrassed by the withdrawal of the only name he thought could save the

State. He would like to have time to consult his colleagues. He would be sorry to see Judge McLean's name introduced now; but he was assured that without that name, *Pennsylvania would be lost by 50,000 majority in the Fall!* In conclusion, he moved to adjourn until 10 o'clock next morning.

The *National Intelligencer*, the organ of the Fillmore opposition, at Washington, spoke of Mr. Buchanan's nomination, as follows:

"Mr. Buchanan is a man of character, of stainless private life, and of long and varied experience in public affairs. As a gentleman, we have nothing to object to him, save his party politics and party career; and although we trust that the anti-Democratic conservative power of the country will be able to beat him, yet, if they should fail, they may still hope that his success will give to the country a President, who will prove a friend to the Union, and more conservative in his administration, than is the political platform upon which he has been placed by the Convention."

As a comment upon the course of some of the opposition papers, we may add, that before the National Democratic Convention met, they were very confident that Mr. Buchanan would not be nominated, and many of them anticipating this result, spoke of him in the highest terms, some saying, that if nominated, it would be vain to make any opposition to him. No doubt much of this grew out of a desire to prepare the Democracy for a state of feeling consequent upon the unexpected defeat of Mr. Buchanan. An evidence of this is to be found in the following paragraph, which was telegraphed to the *New York Tribune*, from Cincinnati, on the 3d of June last:

AN EARLY SURRENDER.—"If Mr. Buchanan's friends fulfil their confident expectations he will be nominated before this reaches the *Tribune*. He will not be nominated at all except by a divided convention, after Thursday night. *His nomination has been generally deprecated by the Republicans as dangerous, if not FATAL to their success.*"

But probably the most complete answer to every charge against Mr. Buchanan, is to be found in the fact, that from Maine to Georgia, the most eminent minds heretofore opposed to the Democratic party are rallying in his support. Look at the list in Pennsylvania. There is Joseph R. Chandler, William B. Reed, Josiah Randall, Frederick Fraley, Eli K. Price, and hundreds of men who have heretofore been the light and the staff of the old Henry Clay party. In Maryland, there are Senators Pearce and Pratt, Reverdy Johnson, and hundreds of men of that class. In Louisiana, Senator J. P. Benjamin. In Missouri, Hon. Sam. Car-

thers, and Mordecai Oliver. In Kentucky, Hon. Wm. E. Preston, and hosts of others. All these men with thousands at their backs agreeing with them, look down with ineffable contempt and scorn upon the calumnies which have grown so stale and so old, that Mr. Greeley himself has got tired and disgusted with them, and in a late number of his *Tribune*, speaks as follows :

“ In opening the Presidential canvass of 1856—a canvass destined to form a memorable epoch in our Nation’s history—we would impress on our compatriots in the support of Fremont and Dayton, and especially our brethren of the Republican Press, the wisdom and sound policy of refraining from all personal warfare. We believe all the candidates in nomination for President and Vice President have sustained fair reputations in all their relations as citizens; and, if it were possible to rake from the dust of oblivion some charge that would tend to the disparagement of one or another of them, we hold it unwise and improper to do so.”

MR. BUCHANAN AND GENERAL JACKSON.—MR.
BUCHANAN AND MR. CLAY.

Andrew Jackson Donelson, whose defence of Mr. Buchanan appears in another part of this pamphlet, has been ransacking some of General Jackson’s *private letters*, to find reflections against Mr. Buchanan. A very brief answer only is necessary here. Two facts will go far to show that Mr. Buchanan bore a relation to General Jackson, such as no man ever maintained who did not secure the confidence of the old hero. After his ten years’ service in the U. S. House of Representatives, Mr. B. retired to private life; and one of the first acts of General Jackson, after that, was to make a voluntary tender to him of the important mission to Russia. The other fact is that which defies denial—that Mr. Polk appointed Mr. Buchanan Secretary of State in his administration, after consultation with General Jackson, who was then residing at the Hermitage, and who recommended and approved the selection. On this latter point, the facts are alike ample and conclusive.

The following from the *Washington Union*, conducted by Hon. A. O. P. Nicholson, of Tennessee, and personally known to all the parties, is so full and complete on this subject, that we copy it entire :

[From the *Washington Union*.]

GEN. JACKSON.—MR. CLAY.—MR. BUCHANAN.

The friends of General Jackson will read the paragraph below, from the *Nashville Union*, with gratification. It is high time that Andrew Jackson should step forward to arrest the ruthless war of ingratitude and

hyena-like malignity, which is being waged on the memory of his father. We trust that the son will be no longer restrained by feelings of delicacy from coming forward to shield the fame of his illustrious father, from the wicked abuse of the confidence which he reposed in such ingrates as Blair and Donelson. There is no lower deep of political degradation, than that to which the man has descended, who would take advantage of the speechless silence of the grave to abuse the confidence of his benefactor with impunity.

We suppose the late publication of what purports to be a part of a private letter of General Jackson, in which he refers to the connection of Mr. Buchanan with the charge of "bargain and intrigue," that involved General Jackson and Mr. Clay in an angry controversy, has induced Major Jackson to express the purpose indicated in the paragraph below. We understand the Nashville Union to intimate that Major Donelson has furnished this extract to his organ in Nashville, for publication. The object of its publication is to exhume from the graves of Jackson and Clay a quarrel which was buried with their bodies, under the hope of exciting the feelings of their respective friends against Mr. Buchanan. We know with how much ardor and earnestness the people of Tennessee and Kentucky contest the ascendancy in their political conflicts; but we know, too, that they are as generous, as brave, and as noble a people as live. We think, therefore, we risk nothing in predicting that the effort to revive a personal quarrel between the friends of the two men, whose memories are respectively dear to the two people, will cause both to turn with loathing and disgust from so unmanly a mode of warfare. It was our fortune to know something personally of General Jackson's feelings and opinions in respect to public men, as also to know from actual observation, the relations between Mr. Clay and Mr. Buchanan. Upon this knowledge, we have the most perfect conviction, that whatever feelings General Jackson and Mr. Clay carried to their graves towards each other, they carried none towards Mr. Buchanan, but those of earnest friendship. Before quoting the paragraph referred to, we commend to our readers, as a conclusive answer to the attempt to misrepresent the relations subsisting between General Jackson and Mr. Clay and Mr. Buchanan, the following extract from a late number of the Nashville Union:

"It is supposed that General Jackson and Mr. Clay knew more about this matter, and how far Mr. Buchanan was answerable, than any other two men that ever lived; and that, if General Jackson and Mr. Clay could excuse Mr. Buchanan of any wrongful intention, and honor him with their confidence, no one else can have proper cause of complaint against him. That Mr. Buchanan's explanation of the misunderstanding that had grown out of the conversation between himself and General Jackson, was entirely satisfactory to Mr. Clay, is a matter of history; many evidences of which could be given, but the following will suffice:"

MR. CLAY TO MR. BROOKE.

"Mr. Buchanan has presented his communication to the public; and although he evidently labors throughout the whole of it to spare and cover General Jackson, he fails in every essential particular to sustain

the General. Indeed, I could not desire a stronger statement from Mr. Buchanan."

Ex-Governor Letcher, the bosom friend of Mr. Clay, writing from Lexington, Ky., August 25, 1827, says:

"With your letter of the 9th, Mr. Buchanan's response to the hero was received. This answer is well put together. As they say in Connecticut, 'there is a great deal of good reading' in Buck's reply. It is modest and gentle, yet strong and conclusive. I am truly delighted with the manner in which Mr. B. has acquitted himself."

We might also quote from Prentice's biography of Mr. Clay, written many years ago, in which he said that Mr. Buchanan had acquitted himself in this matter like "an honorable man." But the fact that Mr. Clay did not censure Mr. Buchanan, after being made to understand the facts, is too notorious for argument.

As to General Jackson, it is a matter interwoven with the history of the country—whatever scandalous betrayals of private confidence men may now make by parading letters shamefully perverted, and that were never intended to be published—that a warm and cordial intimacy and mutual regard and confidence existed between him and Mr. Buchanan to the last hour of the old hero's life.

All these old, unpleasant difficulties, rejuvenated by the Banner, through the aid of Maj. Donelson, were enacted from 1825 to 1827. Four years afterwards, upon retiring from Congress, in 1831, Mr. Buchanan received from Gen. Jackson, unsolicited, the high compliment and trust of the mission to Russia, in which capacity he rendered the country the important service of negotiating the first commercial treaty between the United States and Russia, which secured to our commerce the ports of the Baltic and the Black Sea.

Mr. Polk is known to have gone to the Hermitage, upon the eve of his departure, for the special purpose of consulting General Jackson on the subject of his Cabinet. Pennsylvania, led by James Buchanan, had contributed her electoral vote to his election. General Jackson had known Mr. Buchanan intimately for twenty years. The consequence was, Mr. Polk invited Mr. Buchanan to accept the portfolio of the State Department, the head of his Cabinet. It was in view of all these things, and the grave importance of the mission, that President Pierce sent him as Minister to England. And it is for his purity of public and private character, as attested by the confidence of Jackson, Polk, and Pierce, and the large and comprehensive statesmanship which he manifested in all these important public stations, filled at their solicitation, that the Democratic party have put him forward as their candidate for the Presidency.

If Mr. Clay "could not ask a stronger statement from Mr. Buchanan," and respected his great public worth, as he frequently attested when they were both members of the United States Senate in 1841—if General Jackson could so esteem him as to appoint him to an important foreign mission in 1831, recommend him to Mr. Polk as a Cabinet officer, and express regret for his defeat for the Senate as late as 1845—is it not the most contemptible twaddle for men who have been treacherous themselves to both the old parties, led respectively by Clay and Jackson, to be raising

a hue and cry at this day, against so venerable a patriot and sage as James Buchanan? This is all we have to say on this branch of the subject.

It is in reference to the letter of Gen. Jackson, alluded to in the foregoing article, that the following paragraph appeared in a subsequent issue of the Nashville Union:

“We were much gratified a few days since, to receive a visit, from Mr. Andrew Jackson, the present occupant of the Hermitage. He expressed himself greatly mortified at the wanton and unauthorized use which has recently been made of the private letters of his father, Gen. Jackson—letters which the unworthy possessors of, would sooner stick their heads in the fire than to have published, if the old hero had been living. Mr. Jackson regards the use which has been made of these random letters as an outrage upon the memory of his revered father not longer to be submitted to in silence, and which he can and will effectually crush if persisted in.”

MR. BUCHANAN'S OWN STATEMENT.

The following letter from the Hon. James Buchanan, to which both Mr. Clay and Mr. Letcher refer, is so candid, frank, and plain a statement, that we publish it entire. It was after the publication of this letter, that General Jackson offered to Mr. Buchanan the post of Minister to Russia, and recommended his appointment as Secretary of State to President Polk:

To the Editor of the Lancaster Journal.

The Cincinnati *Advertiser* was last night placed in my hands by a friend, containing an address from Gen. Jackson to the public, dated on the 18th ultimo, in which he announces me to be the Member of Congress to whom he had referred, in his letter to Mr. Beverly of the 5th of June last. The duty which I owe to the public, and to myself, now compels me to publish to the world, the only conversation which I ever held with Gen. Jackson, on the subject of the last Presidential election, prior to its termination.

In the month of December, 1824, a short time after the commencement of the session of Congress, I heard, among other rumors then in circulation, that Gen. Jackson had determined, should he be elected President, to continue Mr. Adams in the office of Secretary of State. Although I felt certain he had never intimated such an intention, yet I was sensible that nothing could be better calculated both to cool the ardor of his friends, and to inspire his enemies with confidence, than the belief that he had already selected *his chief competitor*, for the highest office within his gift. I thought General Jackson owed it to himself and to the cause, in which his political friends were engaged, to contradict this report; and to declare that he would not appoint to that office the man, however worthy he might be, who stood at the head of the most formidable party of his political enemies. These being my impressions, I addressed a letter to a confidential friend in Pennsylvania, then and still high in office, and exalted in character, and one who had ever been the decided advocate of General Jackson's election, requesting his opinion and advice upon the subject. I received his answer, dated the 27th December, 1824, upon the 29th, which is now before me, and which strengthened and confirmed my previous opinion.

I then finally determined, either that I would ask General Jackson myself, or get another of his friends to ask him—whether he had ever declared he

would appoint Mr. Adams his Secretary of State. In this manner, I hoped a contradiction of the report might be obtained from himself and that he might probably declare it was not his intention to appoint Mr. Adams.

A short time previous to the receipt of the letter to which I have referred, my friend Mr. Markley and myself got into conversation, as we very often did, both before and after, upon the subject of the Presidential election, and concerning the person who would probably be selected by General Jackson, to fill the office of Secretary of State. I feel sincerely sorry that I am compelled thus to introduce his name; but I do so with the less reluctance, because it has already, without any agency of mine, found its way into the newspapers, in connection with this transaction.

Mr. Markley adverted to the rumor which I have mentioned, and said it was calculated to injure the General. He observed, that Mr. Clay's friends were warmly attached to him, and that he thought they would endeavor to act in concert at the election. That if they did so, they could either elect Mr. Adams or General Jackson at their pleasure; but that many of them would never agree to vote for the latter, if they knew he had predetermined to prefer another to Mr. Clay, for the first office in his gift. And that some of the friends of Mr. Adams had already been holding out the idea, that in case he were elected, Mr. Clay might probably be offered the situation of Secretary of State.

I told Mr. Markley, that I felt confident General Jackson had never said he would appoint Mr. Adams Secretary of State; because he was not in the habit of conversing upon the subject of the election; and if he were, whatever might be his secret intention, he had more prudence than to make such a declaration. I mentioned to him that I had been thinking, either that I would call upon the General myself, or get some one of his other friends to do so, and thus endeavored to obtain from him a contradiction of the report; although I doubted whether he would hold any conversation upon the subject.

Mr. Markley urged me to do so; and observed, if General Jackson had not determined whom he would appoint Secretary of State, and should say that it would not be Mr. Adams, it might be a great advantage to our cause, for us so to declare, upon his own authority; we should then be placed upon the same footing with the Adams men, and might fight them with their own weapons. That the western members would naturally prefer voting for a western man, if there were a probability that the claims of Mr. Clay to the second office in the Government should be fairly estimated; and that if they thought proper to vote for Gen. Jackson, they could soon decide the contest in his favor.

A short time after this conversation, on the 30th December, 1824, (I am enabled to fix the time not only from my own recollection, but from letters which I wrote on that day, on the day following, and on the 2d January, 1825) I called upon General Jackson. After the company had left him, by which I found him surrounded, he asked me to take a walk with him; and whilst we were walking together upon the street, I introduced the subject. I told him, I wished to ask him a question in relation to the Presidential election; that I knew he was unwilling to converse upon the subject; that therefore if he deemed the question improper, he might refuse to give it an answer. That my only motive in asking it, was friendship for him, and I trusted he would excuse me for thus introducing a subject, about which I knew he wished to be silent.

His reply was complimentary to myself, and, accompanied with a request that I should proceed. I then stated to him, there was a report in circulation, that he had determined he would appoint Mr. Adams Secretary of State, in case he were elected President: and that I wished to ascertain from him

whether he had ever intimated such an intention. That he must at once perceive, how injurious to his election such a report might be. That no doubt, there were several able and ambitious men in the country, among whom I thought, Mr. Clay might be included, who were aspiring to that office; and if it were believed he had already determined to appoint *his chief competitor*, it might have a most unhappy effect upon their exertions, and those of their friends. That unless he had so determined, I thought this report should be promptly contradicted under his own authority.

I mentioned, it had already probably done him some injury, and proceeded to relate to him the substance of the conversation which I had held with Mr. Markley. I do not remember whether I mentioned his name, or merely described him as a friend of Mr. Clay.

After I had finished, the General declared he had not the least objection to answer my question. That he thought well of Mr. Adams; but had never said or intimated, that he would, or that he would not, appoint him Secretary of State. That these things were secrets he would keep to himself—he would conceal them from the very hairs of his head. That if he believed his right hand then knew what his left would do upon the subject of appointments to office, he would cut it off and cast it into the fire. That if he should ever be elected President, it would be without solicitation and without intrigue on his part—that he would then go into office perfectly free and untrammelled, and would be left at perfect liberty to fill the offices of government with the men whom at the time he believed to be the ablest and the best in the country.

I told him that his answer to my question was such an one as I had expected to receive, if he answered it at all; and that I had not sought to obtain it for my own satisfaction. I then asked him if I were at liberty to repeat his answer. He said I was perfectly at liberty to do so to any person I thought proper. I need scarcely remark that I afterwards availed myself of the privilege. The conversation upon this topic here ended—and in all our intercourse since, whether personally or in the course of our correspondence, Gen. Jackson never once adverted to the subject, prior to the date of his letter to Mr. Beverly.

I do not recollect that General Jackson told me I might repeat his answer to Mr. Clay and his friends; though I should be sorry to say he did not. The whole conversation being upon the public street, it might have escaped my observation.

A few remarks more, and I trust I shall have done with this disagreeable business forever.

I called upon Gen. Jackson on the occasion which I have mentioned, solely as his friend, upon my individual responsibility, and not as the agent of Mr. Clay, or any other person. I never have been the political friend of Mr. Clay since he became a candidate for the office of President, as you very well know. Until I saw Gen. Jackson's letter to Mr. Beverly of the 5th ult., and at the same time was informed by letter from the Editor of the United States *Telegraph*, that I was the person to whom he alluded, the conception never once entered my mind, that he deemed me to have been the agent of Mr. Clay, or of his friends, or that I had intended to propose to him terms of any kind from them, or that he could have supposed me to be capable of expressing the "opinion that it was right to fight such intriguers with their own weapons." Such a supposition, had I entertained it, would have rendered me exceedingly unhappy; as there is no man upon earth whose good opinion I more value than that of General Jackson. He could not, I think, have received this impression until after Mr. Clay and his friends had actually elected Mr. Adams President, and Mr. Adams had appointed Mr. Clay Secretary of State. After these events had transpired, it may be readily conjectured, in what manner

my communication might have led him into the mistake. I deeply deplore that such has been its effect.

I owe it to my own character to make another observation. Had I ever known, or even suspected that Gen. Jackson believed I had been sent to him by Mr. Clay or his friends, I should have immediately corrected his erroneous impression; and thus prevented the necessity for this most unpleasant explanation. When the Editor of the *United States Telegraph*, on the 12th of October last, asked me by letter for information upon the subject, I promptly informed him by the returning mail on the 16th of that month, that I had no authority from Mr. C. or his friends, to propose any terms to Gen. Jackson in relation to their votes, nor did I ever make any such proposition; and that I trusted I would be as incapable of becoming a messenger, upon such an occasion, as it was known Gen. Jackson would be to receive such a message. I have deemed it necessary to make this statement, in order to remove any misconception which may have been occasioned by the publication, in the *Telegraph*, of my letter to the editor, dated the 11th ultimo.

With another remark, I shall close this communication. Before I held the conversation with Gen. Jackson, which I have detailed, I called upon Major Eaton, and requested him to ask Gen. Jackson, whether he had ever declared or intimated, that he would appoint Mr. Adams Secretary of State, and expressed a desire that the General should say, if consistent with truth, that he did not intend to appoint him to that office. I believed that such a declaration would have a happy influence upon the election, and I endeavored to convince him that such would be its effect. The conversation between us was not so full as that with General Jackson. The Major politely declined to comply with my request, and advised me to propound the question to the General myself, as I possessed a full share of his confidence.

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Lancaster, 8th August, 1827.

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE LABORING MAN.

No public man has ever been more consistent in his defence of measures, in which the laboring classes have been interested, than Mr. Buchanan. While a Senator in Congress, he was probably the most effective advocate of all laws to liberalize and improve the Charter of the District of Columbia, particularly in his opposition to the circulation of small notes, that vitiated currency from which so many evils have sprung, and by which so many honest men and women have suffered. The explosions of the shin plaster shops, in the city of Washington, would never have occurred, had the laws for which Mr. Buchanan pleaded so earnestly in the Senate, been enforced. His speeches in favor of a liberal land policy, to enable the enterprising poor man to settle upon the public lands, and be free from the clutches of those speculators, who so often take up millions of acres, for the purpose of coining fortunes out of the honest emigrant, are memorable. He was one of the earliest advocates of liberalizing the Constitution of Pennsylvania, so as to render it more popular in its character. In 1840, when everything seemed to be "fair in politics," a grand clamor was raised against Mr. Buchanan, on the ground that he had argued in the Senate, in his speech of 22d of January, 1840, in favor of

paying the American laborer but ten cents a day. It teaches us a lesson now, when we see so many men (even among those who are at present supporting Mr. Fremont and Mr. Fillmore) coming forward and regretting and withdrawing this unjust accusation. This charge then rung from every stump; thousands of men were misled by it; but time and reflection have done the work, and Mr. Buchanan is vindicated. A great revolution has taken place since he made the admirable speech from which this perverted statement was wrested. When he spoke, the country was suffering under the effects of a contraction in the money market, resulting from the explosion of the Bank of the United States, and every branch of industry was more or less affected by the condition of financial affairs. The Independent Treasury was then that great bugbear, which was to withdraw all the specie from circulation, and to ruin everybody, high and low. It was to prove the advantage of a sound currency, that Mr. Buchanan spoke against that multiplication of paper money, from which so many evils have sprung. But the objections to the Independent Treasury have been answered by results. Where is there now to be found, the man who doubts that the Independent Treasury has been of immense advantage to commerce and to trade; and where is the mechanic, or the laboring man, who sees for himself, how important it is to his interest to have sound banks or gold and silver, who will not look back upon the attacks upon Mr. Buchanan's Independent Treasury speech, in 1840, with something of confusion, that he should have permitted himself for a moment to be deluded by the accusations of the opposition? Mr. Greeley of the *New York Tribune*, again comes forward to make a clean breast of it. We copy from the *Tribune*, since Mr. Buchanan's nomination:

"The charge that Mr. Buchanan has advocated a reduction of laboring men's wages to ten cents per day, has but a very partial support in fact. He certainly never made any such proposition directly, nor anything, which he understood to have that effect."

Now, the editor of the *Tribune* should have been still more frank; he should have stated that no man did half so much as himself to keep alive sixteen years ago, the very falsehood which, at this late hour, he comes forward to clear his conscience of. Better late than never, however, and we congratulate the leading organ of the Fremont party upon the unconscious confession of its own sins, and the lesson it teaches those who are accustomed to believe in it.

FRANCIS P. BLAIR ANSWERING THIS CALUMNY.

The history of the gross and reckless misrepresentation of Mr. Buchanan's speech of January of 1840, has been written by Francis P. Blair, now one

of the most active friends of Fremont. Mr. Blair, it will be recollected, was the editor of the *Washington Globe* in 1840, and at that time advocated the measures and the man that now encounter his extreme hostility. By degrees he has become so identified with the opposition to the Democratic party, that he has at last become the associate of Mr. Seward and Mr. Giddings. His testimony on the subject of the misrepresentation of Mr. Buchanan's speech is patent to the present attempt of the more reckless opponents of the Democratic party and expose them to ridicule and scorn. We copy from the *Globe*, of March 3, 1840, the following editorial from the pen of Mr. Blair:

[From the *Washington Globe*, March 3, 1840.]

We publish in this evening's *Globe* the remarks of Mr. Buchanan in the Senate on Tuesday last, in relation to the misrepresentations of his speech in favor of the Independent Treasury bill, contained in the published speech of Mr. Davis, (of Mass.) against that measure. It will be perceived that the charge made was, that this gentleman had, throughout his remarks, alleged that Mr. Buchanan had supported the bill on the principle that it would destroy the banking system, and restore an exclusive gold and silver currency, and would, as a necessary consequence, check importations, suppress credit, and reduce the wages of labor and the value of property to one-half their present prices. Such objections have heretofore been those chiefly urged by its enemies against the measure; but, by Mr. Davis, throughout his whole speech, they have been put into the mouth of Mr. Buchanan as arguments in its favor. Every one can perceive how much political capital might be made by circulating throughout the country, that the unfounded objections made to the bill by its open enemies, were not only admitted to exist by so distinguished a friend of the measure as Mr. Buchanan, but had been actually urged by him as arguments in its favor!

So far from this being the fact, the speech of Mr. Buchanan—and we heard every word of it—not only did not contain any such arguments as had been attributed to him by Mr. Davis, but his arguments were all of a contrary character. He ridiculed the idea which had been formerly urged by the opponents of the bill, that "it was to devour all the banks, and establish a pure metallic currency for all the transactions of all the people of the United States," and while he proved conclusively that it would be of inestimable advantage by separating the banks from the Government, he rendered it clear that it would not injuriously affect the banks or the business of the country. How Mr. Davis could have put such arguments into his mouth, as he has done, we are utterly at a loss to conjecture.

A friend of Mr. Buchanan having called his attention to the published speech of Mr. Davis, the former brought the subject before the Senate on Tuesday last, in the remarks which we now publish. Mr. Buchanan conditionally applied the epithet "flagitious," which Mr. Davis had first used in his speech, to characterize the propositions which he said had been advocated by Mr. Buchanan, to the misrepresentations made by Mr. Davis, of Mr. Buchanan's argument. This produced some altercation; but, after the gentlemen had compared notes with each other, the subject seemed to have passed away without appearing to leave any very unpleasant feeling behind. On the next morning, (Wednesday,) Mr. Davis appeared in the Senate, said his remarks on the preceding day had been misunderstood by his friends, and desired a further opportunity of addressing the Senate on the subject; this was delayed by Mr. Grundy's speech, until Friday morning, when Mr. Davis rose and delivered a speech, marked throughout with strong

and personally offensive expressions in regard to Mr. Buchanan's previous remarks, and concluded with the declaration, that "he repelled them with the scorn and contempt which they deserved."

Mr. Buchanan, who is proverbially mild and courteous to his opponents, was left without any alternative but that of treating Mr. Davis with severity. He was perfectly calm and collected in his manner. He commenced with stating what we copy from the notes of our reporter: "That when he had addressed the Senate a few days ago, he had endeavored to state what he believed to be his grievance in the mildest manner which the nature of the case admitted, and to treat the Senator from Massachusetts, so far as he could, with courtesy and respect. The remarks of that gentleman to-day, had, however, absolved him from any such obligation, and he should proceed to treat his misrepresentations as they deserved." We have never heard a more just and conclusive reply, or one more severe in its character. The Senator appeared altogether in a new light. Mr. Davis rejoined; the altercation became quite personal on both sides, and Mr. Buchanan, in conclusion, triumphantly declared that he had fixed the charge of grossly misrepresenting his remarks upon him, and there it should stick like the poisoned shirt of Nessus.

We have not met any candid and impartial man who was present, who does not believe that Mr. Buchanan made out his case clearly and triumphantly. It would have been better, much better, for Mr. Davis, at first, to have admitted the misrepresentations charged, and stated that they were unintentional mistakes, if such were the fact. From the result of the controversy, we entertain not a doubt that he is now of the same opinion. When the entire debate should be published, we have no doubt this will be the settled conviction of our readers.

We now come to a few extracts from the original speech, which has been so much misrepresented, referring those who want a full report of the speech, to the authentic copy, published by the Democratic National Committee, and to be found in the hands of most of the Democratic State and County Committees. We also append other extracts from Mr. Buchanan's subsequent speeches, exposing the misrepresentations of Davis:

Amongst others who undertook to answer Mr. Buchanan's speech, was the Hon. John Davis, of Massachusetts—he that was usually known as "honest John Davis." He assumed in his argument, directly in the teeth of the fact, that Mr. Buchanan had advocated the Independent Treasury on the ground that it would establish an exclusive metallic currency. Starting with this erroneous assumption, he argued to show that it would bring down the wages of labor to the standard of prices in countries where the currency is exclusively metallic. To this speech, when published, there was an appendix, in which he introduced a table, showing that in some of the exclusive metallic countries of Europe laborers only received ten cents a day. Putting the speech and the appendix together, the hint was taken, and a clamor raised that the Democrats were in favor of reducing the wages of labor to ten cents a day.

In a subsequent speech, made on the 3d of March, 1840, Mr. Buchanan denounced the charge against him in the strongest language, saying:

"Self-respect, as well as the respect which I owe to the Senate, restrains me from giving such a contradiction to this allegation as it deserves. It would surely not be deemed improper, however, in me, if I were to turn to the Senator and apply the epithet which he himself has applied to the proposition he imputes to me, and were to declare that such an imputation was a 'flagitious' misrepresentation of my remarks."

Mr. Buchanan repeated his real position as laid down in his original speech, as follows:

"In my remarks I stated distinctly what legislation would, I thought, be required to accomplish this purpose. In the first place, I observed that the banks ought to be compelled to keep in their vaults a certain fair proportion of specie compared with their circulation and deposits; or, in other words, a certain proportion of immediate specie means, to meet their immediate responsibilities. 2d. That the foundation of a specie basis for our paper currency should be laid by prohibiting the circulation of bank notes, at the first under the denomination of ten, and afterwards under that of twenty dollars. 3d. That the amount of bank dividends should be limited. 4th. And, above all, that, upon the occurrence of another suspension, the doors of the banks should be closed at once, and their affairs placed in the hands of commissioners. A certainty that such must be the inevitable effect of another suspension would do more to prevent it than any other cause. To reform, and not to destroy, was my avowed motto. I know that the existence of banks and the circulation of bank paper are so identified with the habits of our people, that they cannot be abolished, even if this were desirable.

"Such a reform in the banking system as I have indicated would benefit every class of society; but, above all others, the man who makes his living by the sweat of his brow. The object at which I aimed by these reforms, was not a pure metallic currency, but a currency of a mixed character; the paper portion of it always convertible into gold and silver, and subject to as little fluctuation in amount as the regular business of the country would admit. Of all reforms, this is what the mechanic and the laboring man ought most to desire. It would produce steady prices and steady employment, and, under its influence, the country would march steadily on in its career of prosperity without suffering from the ruinous expansions and contractions and explosions, which we have endured during the last twenty years. What is most essential to the prosperity of the mechanic and laboring man? Constant employment, steady and fair wages, with uniform prices for the necessaries and comforts of life which he must purchase, and payment for his labor in a sound currency."

After re-stating further his arguments, as presented in his original speech of January 22, Mr. Buchanan said, in reference to the reduction of the wages of laboring men:

"I contended that it would not injure, but greatly benefit, the laboring man, to prevent the violent and ruinous expansions and contractions to which our currency was incident, and, by judicious bank reform, to place it on a settled basis. If this were done, what would be the consequence? That, if the laboring man could not receive as great a nominal amount

for his labor as he did 'in the days of extravagant expansion,' which must always, under our present system, be of short duration, he would be indemnified, and far more than indemnified, by the constant employment, the regular wages, and the uniform and more moderate prices of the necessities and comforts of life which a more stable currency would produce. Can this proposition be controverted? I think not. It is too plain for argument. Mark me, sir, I desire to produce this happy result, not by establishing a pure metallic currency, but 'by reducing the amount of your bank issues within reasonable and safe limits, and establishing a metallic basis for your paper circulation.' The idea plainly expressed is, that it is better, much better, for the laboring man, as well as for every other class of society, except the speculator, that the business of the country should be placed upon that fixed and permanent foundation, which would be laid by establishing such a bank reform as would render it certain that bank notes should be always convertible into gold and silver.

"And yet this plain and simple exposition of my views has been seized upon by those who desire to make political capital out of their perversion; and it has been represented far and wide, that it was my desire to reduce wages down to the prices received by the miserable serfs and laborers of European despotisms. I shall most cheerfully leave the public to decide between me and my traducers. The Senator from Massachusetts, after having attributed to me the intention of reducing the wages of labor to the hard-money standard, through the agency of the Independent Treasury bill, has added, as an appendix to his speech, a statement, made by the Senator from Maryland, (Mr. Merrick,) of the prices of labor in these hard-money despotisms; and it is thus left to be inferred that I am in favor of reducing the honest and independent laborer of this glorious and free country to the same degraded condition. The Senator ought to know that there is too much intelligence among the laboring classes in this highly favored land to be led astray by such representations."

Mr. Clay had charged that the friends of the Independent Treasury desired to reduce the wages of laboring men. As this is the charge which it is now sought to revive, we invite special attention to Mr. Buchanan's reply. It was as follows:

"We are also charged by the Senator from Kentucky with a desire to reduce the wages of the poor man's labor. We have been often termed agrarians on our side of the house. It is something new under the sun to hear the Senator and his friends attribute to us a desire to elevate the wealthy manufacturer at the expense of the laboring man and the mechanic. From my soul I respect the laboring man. Labor is the foundation of the wealth of every country; and the free laborers of the North deserve respect both for their probity and their intelligence. Heaven forbid that I should do them wrong! Of all the countries on the earth, we ought to have the most consideration for the laboring man. From the very nature of our institutions, the wheel of fortune is constantly revolving and producing such mutations in property, that the wealthy man of to-day may become the poor laborer of to-morrow. Truly wealth often takes to itself wings and flies away. A large fortune rarely

lasts beyond the third generation, even if it endure so long. We must all know instances of individuals obliged to labor for their daily bread, whose grandfathers were men of fortune. The regular process of society would almost seem to consist of the efforts of one class to dissipate the fortunes which they have inherited, whilst another class, by their industry and economy, are regularly rising to wealth. We have all, therefore, a common interest, as it is our common duty, to protect the rights of the laboring man; and if I believed for a moment that this bill would prove injurious to him, it should meet my unqualified opposition.

“Although this bill will not have as great an influence as I could desire, yet, as far as it goes, it will benefit the laboring man as much, and probably more than any other class of society. What is it he ought most to desire? Constant employment, regular wages, and uniform, reasonable prices for the necessaries and comforts of life which he requires. Now, sir, what has been his condition under our system of expansions and contractions? He has suffered more by them than any other class of society. The rate of his wages is fixed and known; and they are the last to rise with the increasing expansion, and the first to fall when the corresponding revulsion occurs. He still continues to receive his dollar per day, whilst the price of every article which he consumes is rapidly rising. He is at length made to feel that, although he nominally earns as much, or even more than he did formerly, yet, from the increased price of all the necessaries of life, he cannot support his family. Hence he strikes for higher wages, and the uneasy and excited feelings which have at different periods existed among the laboring classes. But the expansion at length reaches the exploding point, and what does the laboring man now suffer? He is for a season thrown out of employment altogether. Our manufactures are suspended; our public works are stopped; our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned; and, whilst others are able to weather the storm, he can scarcely procure the means of bare subsistence.”

The predictions of Mr. Buchanan have been wonderfully fulfilled. No reduction in wages has taken place, as a consequence of keeping the public money out of the banks, but a condition of things has succeeded to that great measure, which has assisted every branch of commerce and of labor.

It will appear that not one line, or syllable, in Mr. Buchanan's speech of January, 1840, or any other of his speeches, can be found to justify the allegation that he favored the reduction of wages. The whole false fabric falls to the ground.

In connection with this subject, we will here introduce an extract from the remarks of the Hon. C. J. FAULKNER, of Va., at the Ratification meeting held in Washington City:

I represent in Congress a district which abounds, perhaps, to a greater extent than any in Virginia, in laboring men—I mean men who live by

their own toil, and by the daily, weekly, or yearly wages of hard and honest labor. National workshops, machine-shops, and manufacturing establishments may be seen at short intervals, from the time you enter that district at Harper's Ferry, until you leave it, some thirty miles west of Cumberland. When on my way to Cincinnati, towards the close of last month, and when I passed the principal points where these establishments are located—Harper's Ferry, Martinsburg, and Piedmont—these noble sons of toil, these brawny, hard-fisted men of labor, crowded around the cars to express their most anxious wishes for the nomination of James Buchanan. "For God's sake, give us Buchanan," was the impassioned cry of many of them. I dwelt upon this fact upon more than one occasion in Cincinnati. For, I thought when the popular instinct was thus so firmly directed, and the popular heart thus vividly aroused, it would, indeed, have been a most rash and dangerous experiment to have disregarded it. I do not believe there is now living in this country a public man more deeply enthroned in the hearts of the laboring men, than James Buchanan. [Great applause.] It would be quite an entertaining sight to see one of those advocates of the bank rags of 1839 and 1840—one of those champions of a false, spurious, and irredeemable paper currency—seek to insult the intelligence of such men as these by the cry of "Ten-cent Jemmy." I see that some of our leading Democratic editors are gravely occupied in vindicating Mr. Buchanan from this "ten-cent and low-wages" calumny. It is all waste time. The great mass of the people understand that subject far better than the Know-Nothing editors who publish such stuff. I have not met with a laboring man of ordinary intelligence in my district, who does not understand the origin of this story about "low wages and ten cents," who cannot tell you how the lie was gotten up; what temporary purpose it was intended to serve; and how justly the whole affair deserves the scorn and contempt of every fair mind. They know that the very speech from which they pretend to derive this misrepresentation, is one of the noblest vindications of the rights and interests of the laboring man, and as such, it shall, as far as I am able, find its way into the hands of every artizan and mechanic in the country before November next. The laboring men of the country look upon the whole story as one that has passed into the sewer of forgotten calumnies, and not to be recollected, except as a scar received by Mr. Buchanan in his gigantic conflict with bank monopoly and bank corruption, or referred to as a memorial of those days when he stood up in the Senate house—and there were giants in those days—as the unflinching advocate of the interests of honest labor against the outside pressure of swindlers, shavers and speculators. [Immense cheering.]

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE NATIONAL ARMORIES.

A mechanic of the city of Baltimore, in a letter to the editor of the *Baltimore Argus*, of the 9th of July last, reproduces another evidence of Mr. Buchanan's attachment to the laboring classes. We copy as follows. The votes of Mr. Buchanan, as a member of the Senate, were consistently

given in support of the Civil, and for the overthrow of the Military system, as the records of that body abundantly prove.

In 1841, the supervision of National Armories was changed from civil to military, the result of which became so odious by the petty military orders, rules and regulations, from time to time issued by the commanding officer, that indignation meetings were held, and a committee appointed to proceed to Washington from the armory at Harper's Ferry, for the purpose of restoring the old civil system, which had been the government of the armory from its foundation by Gen. Washington. I was one of that committee, and we enlisted all the force in the Senate and House we could for the restoration of a civilian. I called upon and afterwards addressed the Hon. James Buchanan, of Pa., and received in reply the following letter :

SENATE CHAMBER, July 12, 1842.

Dear Sir:—The pressure of public business has prevented me from acknowledging the receipt of your letter at an earlier day. I cheerfully espouse your cause. I am clearly of opinion that the workmen at our armories ought to be placed under a civil, and not military superintendance; and I sincerely regret that a majority of the Senate have thought differently. In what manner the question may be decided by the House, I cannot anticipate, yet I fear the result.

Yours, sincerely,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

I trust, Mr. Editor, that my fellow-workmen will not be so silly as to believe that Mr. Buchanan, in any shape or manner, is opposed to our best interests. It is wrong, it is unjust to believe otherwise than that he is the friend of labor and its reward.

EIGHTEENTH WARD.

MORE EVIDENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF MR. BUCHANAN AND THE WAGES OF LABOR.

In looking over an old file of the *Army and Navy Chronicle*, says the *Boston Daily Times*, we came across the following letter, written by Mr. Buchanan, then a U. S. Senator from Pennsylvania, to the Hon. Mahlon Dickerson, then Secretary of the Navy. Although written nearly twenty years ago, it is another of the many evidences of the sympathy of James Buchanan for the laboring classes. We cannot find on record anything that would show Mr. Buchanan's want of feeling to the colored men, whom some of our rampant Black Republicans are wont to call "men and brethren;" nor can we find anything which would go to show that Mr. Buchanan, in his proverbial benevolence, gave preference to the negro over the men of his own color and blood. A constitutional democrat, and a friend of the Union, he looks upon the South as equal with the North, and he will sustain the rights of each under the Constitution. As a statesman, he regards this as a government of white men, and not a government of colored men. As a philosopher, he feels that the condition of the three millions of blacks in our Southern States, is incomparably better, in being well fed, well housed, well clothed, and well cared for, in every moral and physical detail, than any other three millions

of negroes that ever have existed, or now exist, in any part of the world. But read the letter of Mr. Buchanan, and the white laborers and mechanics of the North will perceive that his feelings are not intensified upon a race upon whom God has placed his mark, distinguishing them from a superior creation, created for a distinct purpose.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 26, 1837.

My Dear Sir:—Permit me to address you on a subject which has excited much feeling throughout the city and county of Philadelphia, and has enlisted my warmest sympathies.

Five hundred mechanics have been suddenly thrown out of employment in the Navy Yard in Philadelphia, at this inclement season of the year. Most of them depending on their daily labor for their daily bread, you can easily appreciate what must be their sufferings. Their large families (as a friend informs me) are in a most lamentable condition, and God only knows what will become of them unless government gives them employment.

Now, sir, allow me to remark, that nothing short of necessity ought to compel a paternal government to place such a body of mechanics, who have faithfully performed their duty, in such deplorable circumstances. I know that the feelings of your heart will respond to this sentiment. Why not, then, make an effort for their relief? They ask no favor, but to be permitted to give, in their labor, an equivalent for bread for themselves, their wives, and their children. I understand there is now a frigate at the Navy Yard, on which they might be employed.

Even if the department, under other circumstances, should deem it more advisable, for the present, to delay completion, still a mere question of a few months in point of time, becomes comparatively insignificant, when weighed in the balance against humanity and justice. Besides, unless the Navy Yard at Philadelphia is to be abandoned—which I trust is not contemplated by the department—it is of great importance to the government to prevent such a body of faithful and skilful mechanics from dispersing.

I therefore appeal to you, with confidence, to grant them employment—and I almost envy you the power of conferring blessings upon so many in lustrous and meritorious citizens, without doing injury to the Government.

I feel confident you will pardon me for requesting as early an answer to this communication as may be consistent with your convenience.

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Hon. MAHLON DICKERSON, *Secretary of the Navy.*

MR. BUCHANAN'S CHARACTER AT HOME.

It is said that no man is a prophet in his own country; but, after all, the good opinion of one's neighbors is a jewel above price. Mr. Buchanan has resided in the town of Lancaster forty odd years, man and boy. If he had been guilty of any offences against propriety, they would have appeared in that long time. He has had his share of political abuse; he has been a lawyer of great prominence; but throughout, no man has ever been found to question his integrity, or to insinuate a whisper against his reputation in public or private life. He has been a model of uprightness, quiet dignity and gentle deportment, scorning the arts of the demagogue, and discharging all his duties to his fellow-citizens conscientiously. Mr. Buchanan's fortune, which is not very large, has been the result of

hard study, persevering toil, and fair dealing in his profession. He has always given freely in works of charity, and has shown much public spirit. In his own family, his kindness, his gentleness, and his hospitality, are proverbial. The memoir written and published by the Democratic State Central Committee, makes the following allusion to Mr. Buchanan "at home."

At this day, after more than half a century's intercourse as man and boy with the people of his own immediate district, and with the people of Pennsylvania; after having figured prominently in the conflicts of parties; after having shared the confidence of successive Democratic administrations; after having contributed his energies to the overthrow of political heresies without number, he might leave his case to thousands and tens of thousands, who have at various times antagonized his opinions, but now, with the annals of his life before them, stand ready to pay their tribute to his consistency and to his integrity as a public man, by uniting with his political friends in placing him in the Presidential chair! What nobler monument could be raised in commemoration of any American patriot? What more significant refutation of all the accusations of heated party combatants? What more conclusive proof could be given to the nation at large, of the fitness and the merits of a statesman who, after such a lifetime, finds his endorsers in the hearts of the people among whom he has lived, and his warmest supporters among men who have for more than forty years stood in opposition to his opinions?

Let a stranger go to Lancaster now, and he will be surprised to find that hundreds of the leading Whigs of that old county are enrolled among the supporters of James Buchanan—are his active friends, and deem it a pleasing duty, a duty to their State and their country, to support their distinguished fellow-citizen. The old Germans, whom he has defended at the bar, come forward to give their suffrages to the honest and conscientious lawyer; and hundreds whom he served during his Congressional career, are eager to render him their support. The young men are enthusiastically at his side; and the public press, with a single infamous exception, has been glad to bear voluntary testimony to his virtues, his abilities and his deservings.

Two or three instances of Mr. Buchanan's benevolence may as well appear in this connection :

[From the Pittsburg Post.]

BUCHANAN AND PITTSBURG.

On the 10th of April, 1845, a large portion of Pittsburg was laid in ashes by the great fire. There was no telegraph to Pittsburg in those days, and the news of our calamity could only reach Washington by the

14th of April. Mr. Buchanan was then Secretary of State. On that day the following document left Washington for Pittsburg, addressed by Mr. Buchanan to Wm J. Howard, then mayor of our city. Comment is unnecessary, even to those maligners who would represent Mr. Buchanan as cold and selfish :

£500.]

WASHINGTON, April 14, 1845.

Cashier of the Bank of Metropolis : Pay to the order of W. J. Howard, mayor of the city of Pittsburg, for the use of the sufferers by the late fire, five hundred dollars.

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Dear Sir:—Will you please to accept and apply the above towards the relief of the sufferers in the late dreadful calamity. My feelings of sympathy and compassion have never been so strongly excited upon any similar occasion. But let the people be of good cheer, and exert their accustomed energy, and, under the blessings of Providence, all will yet be well, and Pittsburg will arise more glorious than ever from its ashes.

JAMES BUCHANAN.

W. J. HOWARD, Esq.

WHAT HIS NEIGHBORS SAY OF HIM.

It is no matter of trifling consideration and importance that those who know a man best should eulogise him most. More especially is praise to be valued when it is extorted from a political opponent. The Lancaster (Pennsylvania) *Express*, a Know-Nothing Republican paper, published in the immediate neighborhood of Mr. Buchanan's residence, is compelled to bear testimony to his unbending integrity and blameless life. After a few introductory remarks, the editor proceeds, and says :

“We know the man as one of our most respected fellow-citizens; a gentleman of unblemished personal integrity and unusually agreeable manners in his social intercourse with all classes. We know him as the friend of the poor, as a perpetual benefactor of the poor widows of this city, who, when the piercing blasts of each successive winter brought shrieks of cold, and hunger, and want, in the frail tenements of poverty, could apply to the ‘Buchanan Relief Donation’ for their annual supply of wood, and sitting down with their orphaned children in the cheerful warmth of a blazing fire, lift their hearts in silent gratitude to God, and teach their little ones to bless the name of James Buchanan. As a citizen, a neighbor, a friend, in a word, as simply James Buchanan, we yield to no man in the measure of our respect and esteem; and were he still before us as *simply* James Buchanan, as he was a few years, and he and we occupied the same broad Jeffersonian republican platform, when at least one of the editors of this paper voted with him year after year the same Democratic ticket, then ours would be the more pleasing duty of supporting instead of opposing the election of our esteemed

fellow-citizen and neighbor to the highest office in the gift of the American people, and the highest position of political distinction in the world."

A STRIKING TRAIT IN MR. BUCHANAN'S CHARACTER.

In his long intercourse with public men, why is it that Mr. Buchanan, whom his opponents now call "a cold-hearted man," can point to such an army of enthusiastic and devoted friends? He has them not only at home, but in every State in the Union. He finds them not merely in the higher walks of public life, but in every class and station of society. While a member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, a period something over twenty years, he made friends who adhered to him through life, many of whom are still living. While in the Cabinet of President Polk, he was a favorite of his associates, without exception. He can recall, with pleasure, his companionship with Lewis F. Linn, of Missouri, and with Ambrose H. Sevier, of Arkansas, gallant spirits, now gathered to their fathers. He was the friend of Levi Woodbury, the companion of Wm. R. King, of Roane, of Silas Wright, of John C. Calhoun, of Felix Grundy, and of all that sterling race of men who adorned the era in which he was an actor. At the present moment Bancroft, the historian, William L. Marey, Robert J. Walker, Nathan Clifford, Isaac Toucey, John Y. Mason, and Cave Johnson, his associates during the memorable administration of Mr. Polk, are all advocating his election, and nearly all ardently preferred him before all others as a candidate for the Presidency.

It cannot be a cold-hearted man who can retain such men at his side through so many years. It proves fidelity to his friends, truth in his dealings with them, and a readiness at all times to respond to a generous action.

The following is from the pen of a very distinguished old line Whig in Philadelphia:

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE OSTEND MANIFESTO.

The self-styled neutral press—of that class who are loud in vaunting their perfect independence of politics—of which the "*Evening Bulletin*" is a malignant type, are busy and constant in their efforts to misrepresent the purport of this celebrated paper. I am a Whig—a Whig of the Clay, Webster and Sergeant school. I was a Whig when what is now Black Republicanism was fanatical abolitionism—resisted as ably and strenuously by our great leaders as it was by the Democratic party. I am a Whig still, and think I stand on the same platform with reference to the only issues before the country that Clay and Webster stood. They were opposed to *Sectionalism*, to abolitionism—so am I. And were they alive, I doubt not they would cast their vote

as I intend to vote in November next—for James Buchanan. I shall vote for him, because he is the only candidate who represents fully the principle with reference to the slavery question, that I think vital to the safety of the country, and the permanence of the union of the States; because he represents the only party that is national in its character, and has positive and governing strength in every section of the confederacy, North, South, East and West. I shall vote for him because the platform of the party which has nominated him, proposes to remove the Slavery agitation from the halls of Congress entirely, where it has always been, and always will be, a cause of discord and strife, and to let the people of the Territories or States decide for themselves the character of their domestic institutions. I shall vote for him, because he is a statesman of enlarged experience, conservative in his character, and who, apart from the impregnable position occupied by himself and his party on the Slavery question, upon which the Union depends, is eminently qualified to conduct the affairs, both foreign and domestic, of Government, with honor in these difficult times. I shall vote for him, because I think his position with reference to Cuba, as laid down in the "Ostend Manifesto," eminently wise and sound, and if understood properly, will meet with a hearty response from every true American citizen. It is fortunate for Mr. Buchanan that his real position on the Cuban question is susceptible of an elucidation so clear and certain, that no apology for misconstruction or misrepresentation can exist. The "Ostend Manifesto" itself furnishes a triumphant answer to the charge so flippantly made, "that Mr. Buchanan does not hesitate to say that we *must have Cuba at all risks*. If Spain refuse to sell, then take it (Cuba) by force!" I undertake to prove from the paper itself, that no such doctrine or sentiments are entertained or found in it. The argument of the Ostend paper is clear, concise, and to the point—that we should not acquire Cuba *without the consent of Spain, UNLESS JUSTIFIED BY THE GREAT LAW OF SELF-PRESERVATION.*

The Ostend document holds this language:

"It must be clear to every reflecting mind that, from the peculiarity of its geographical position and the considerations attendant on it, Cuba is as necessary to the North American republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs naturally to that great family of States of which the Union is the providential nursery.

"From its locality it commands the mouth of the Mississippi, and the immense and annually increasing trade, which must seek this avenue to the ocean.

"On the numerous navigable streams, measuring an aggregate course of some thirty thousand miles, which disembogue themselves through this magnificent river into the Gulf of Mexico, the increase of the population, within the last ten years, amounts to more than that of the entire Union at the time Louisiana was annexed to it.

"The natural and main outlet to the products of this entire population, the highway of their direct intercourse with the Atlantic and the Pacific States, can never be secure, but must ever be endangered, whilst Cuba is a dependency of a distant power, in whose possession it has proved to be a source of constant annoyance and embarrassment to their interests.

"Indeed, the Union can never enjoy repose, nor possess reliable security, as long as Cuba is not embraced within its boundaries.

"After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question: Does Cuba in the possession of Spain seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union?

"Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain, if we pos-

sess the power—and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor, if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home.

“Under such circumstances, we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter into the question whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure.

“Our past history forbids that we should acquire the island of Cuba without the consent of Spain, *unless justified by the great law of self-preservation*. We must, in any event, preserve our own conscientious rectitude and our own self-respect.

“But if Spain, deaf to the voice of her own interest, and actuated by stubborn pride and a false sense of honor, should refuse to sell Cuba to the United States, then the question will arise, what ought to be the course of the American government under such circumstances.

“Self-preservation is the first law of nature, with States as well as with individuals. All nations have at different periods acted upon this maxim. Although it has been made the pretext for committing flagrant injustice, as in the partition of Poland, and other similar cases which history records, yet the principle itself, though often abused, has always been recognised.”

Mr. Buchanan's position is, that if Spain refuses to sell, then (not that our government shall take it by force) will be the time to consider the question: Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union?

Let us be specific on this matter. Mr. Buchanan lays down the great law of self preservation as applicable to States as well as individuals. Will any one dispute the truth of that position? He says that, as important as Cuba is to our peace and prosperity, we should not think of acquiring it without the consent of Spain, *except* in the last resort, as a means of saving our own nation from ruin. Will any one venture to take issue with him on this position? He says that, before considering the question whether the acquisition of Cuba is essential for our preservation, we should offer to buy the island, and even to offer more than its value. Will anybody come forward to dispute this position? He says that if Spain refuses to sell at such price, it will then be time for our government to consider the momentous question whether Cuba is essential to our self-preservation; and if it shall be decided in the affirmative, then, to save ourselves from ruin, we should take Cuba at any cost or peril. Who can successfully gainsay this proposition? Who will say that “an individual would not be justified in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor, if that were the only means of saving his own home?”

I have no fears that the people, the sound conservative, right-thinking, right-minded people, will be misled by the misrepresentations of partizan zealots; in this age of steam-presses, no public man of the country has perhaps so little to fear from a dispassionate examination of his record—which can be found on almost every page of our history for the last thirty years.

Nominated by his party for the highest office in the world, without any seeking either by word or deed from him—thousands and thousands of his old political opponents are flocking to his standard, as the only means of saving the institutions of the country from civil discord and strife. His election in November next is certain.

The men and the papers now engaged in misrepresenting the Ostend Manifesto, and especially those who think it will arouse the animosity of Spain, should know that the manifesto, when received in Spain, so far from

being hurtful, was succeeded by a state of feeling among the Spanish statesmen, of the most satisfactory character. Its reasoning and conclusions are such as no upright man, especially no American, could then, or can now, conscientiously resist or refute.

MR. CLAY SPEAKS—HEAR HIM!

We find in the *Lexington Observer and Reporter*, a letter copied from the *Kentucky Statesman*, which we publish with great satisfaction. It is from James B. Clay, a son of Henry Clay, the great American Statesman, whom all men delight to honor.

This letter is the best refutation that could be made of the stale slanders now attempted to be revived by a venal partizan press, relative to the unfounded charges against Mr. Buchanan—charges denied by Henry Clay himself, by his biographer, and now by the public generally. The high personal regard which these distinguished statesmen ever entertained for each other, also effectually disproves these malicious fabrications.

Mr. Clay, in announcing his determination to vote for Mr. Buchanan, assumes a position which is alike honorable to himself and the powerful party of which his honored father was the acknowledged leader.

[From the *Kentucky Statesman*.]

MR. EDITOR:—I desire, through your courtesy, to correct a statement made in the *Statesman* of the 4th inst., which does great injustice to two of my friends, and political brothers, the Hon. Joshua F. Bell, of Boyle, and the Hon. William B. Kinkead, of Kenton, and which moreover is untrue. The article to which I refer, states "that resolutions expressing the confidence of the Whigs of Kentucky in Mr. Fillmore, and saying he was worthy of their support as in 1848," were rejected by the votes of sixteen counties to one, in the State Convention held at Louisville, on the 31 inst., and that Mr. Bell and Kinkead advocated them.

It is undeniably true that such resolutions were offered in the Convention by Col. Hopkins, of Henderson, and it is also true that they were laid upon the table by a vote of sixteen counties to one. But it is not true that either Mr. Bell or Mr. Kinkead voted for them; on the contrary, both gentlemen opposed them, as I have reason to believe they would have done, resolutions to endorse any one but a true old line Whig for the office of President. It was, also, at the express desire and request of Mr. Kinkead that Mr. Adams withdrew his motion, to the effect "that the Whigs of Kentucky have undiminished confidence in Millard Fillmore." It is, however, but candid to say, that every member of the Convention understood that Mr. Bell and Judge Kinkead preferred Mr. Fillmore to either Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fremont; neither of them made any attempt to do so gross and unjust a thing, as to commit an old line Whig Convention to the endorsement of anybody but a Whig.

There is also a statement copied into the *Observer and Reporter* of the 5th inst., "that I had been heard to say, that I was not for Buchanan." I may have said that Mr. Buchanan was not my candidate, or was not my choice for the Presidency; but I have not said that I should not vote for him. I prefer Mr. Fillmore personally, and if he stood on the same principles he did in 1850, I would vote for him in preference to any man I know. But I expect to cast my vote for that candidate who, in my opinion, may have the best chance to defeat the candidate of the Black Republican party; and, at present advised, I think Mr. Buchanan has the best chance to do so. I wish it, nevertheless, to be distinctly understood, that if I shall think it my duty to vote for Mr. Buchanan, I shall vote as an old line Whig, making a choice of what he believes to be evils, for the good of the country; and that whenever the Whig standard shall again be raised, adhering always to the principles which I have been instrumental in asserting at Lexington, and at Louisville on the 3d July, I shall be ready, fairly, honestly and fearlessly to battle against those principles and practices of the Democratic party which conflict with our own views.

I feel sure, Mr. Editor, that your readers will not do me the injustice to attribute to me too great a desire to force myself before their notice, in venturing to correct misrepresentations affecting my friends and myself, however well I may know the little importance that may be attached to any opinions of mine. I hope the *Observer and Reporter* will also do me the favor, as well as justice, to copy this letter. I am sir, respectfully, &c.,


Your obedient servant,


JAMES B. CLAY

Ashland, July 8, 1856.

WHERE ARE HENRY CLAY'S FAMILY AND FRIENDS?


All of Mr. Clay's immediate family, with a single exception, are in the same position as the gentleman above referred to, and some are openly out for Buchanan. The sons of the old Henry Clay leader, John Sergeant, of Philadelphia, are out for Buchanan, and in the Senate, Henry Clay Whigs, like Benjamin, of La., Pratt, of Md., Pearce, of Md., and J. C. Jones, of Tenn., have taken open ground in favor of Buchanan's election.











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 645 8